



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/767,291	12/16/96	VRZALIK	J 06-2916.295

EXAMINER

CHARLES W HANOR
AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD
300 CONVENT STREET
SUITE 1500
SAN ANTONIO TX 78205

PRIORITY UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3508

DATE MAILED: 01/31/97

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined ☒ Responsive to communication filed on 12/16/96 ☒ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), 0 days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned/ 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- ☐ Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
- ☐ Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152.
- ☐ Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.
- ☐

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claim 1 ^{is} pending in the application.

Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.

2. ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.

3. ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.

4. ☒ Claim 1 ^{is} rejected.

5. ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.

6. ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7. ☐ This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.

8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).

10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner; ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been ☐ approved; ☐ disapproved (see explanation).

12. ☐ Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received ☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.

13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14. ☐ Other

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Art Unit: 3508

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. In response to this Office action, Applicant is required to submit a proposed drawing correction including the objections raised in the prior office action mailed January 26, 1996. However, correction of the noted defects can be deferred until the application is allowed by the examiner.

Specification

2. The specification is objected to because it does not include certain reference signs shown in the drawings. 37 CFR § 1.84(f) states, "Reference signs not mentioned in the description shall not appear in the drawing and vice versa." The following reference signs are not mentioned in the description: Figure 2, "49" and "50"; Figure 5, "94"; Figure 6, "111", "126 and "127"; and Figure 8, "151". Correction is required.
3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
- a. Page 6, line 7, --30-- should be inserted for "31";
 - b. Page 6, line 18, --and-- should be inserted for "rand";
 - c. Page 7, line 6, the dash after "44" should be deleted;
 - d. "33" is used to reference the "cover" (page 12, line 7) and the "foot cushion" (page 14, line 20);
 - e. The "foot cushion" is referenced as "33" (page 6, line 7 and Figure 1) and "35" (page 13, line 6);
 - f. Page 16, "149" is used to designate both the "mounting plate" (line 10) and "the bushing" (line 16); and

Art Unit: 3508

- g. Page 18, "156" is used to designate both the "micro-controller" (line 1) and one of the "membrane switches" (line 2);

Appropriate correction is required.

4. The Abstract of the Disclosure is objected to because the first line is grammatically incorrect; it is not a complete sentence. In line 1, --has-- should be inserted for "with".

Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,847,929 to Pupovic, U.S. Patent No. 4,858,260 to Failor et al. or U.S. Patent No. 4,862,529 to Peck.

Pupovic '929 discloses a bed comprising a frame including a mattress support having at least a first articulatable leg region (13), a second articulatable seat region (11) and a third articulatable head region (7); a raise-and-lower mechanism (2, 3) for generally raising and lowering the entire mattress support relative to a floor engaging portion (1) of the frame; an articulation mechanism (9, 15) for articulating the patient surface from a horizontal, lying position to a seated position; and controls (9, 17) for tilting the mattress support (see Figure 7).

Failor et al. '260 discloses bed including a trendelenburg mechanism comprising a frame including a mattress support (18, 20, 22), an articulation mechanism (114), a raise-and-lower mechanism (not shown) positioned within a polymeric casing (30), and controls (102) for tilting the mattress support.

Art Unit: 3508

Peck '529 discloses a bed comprising a frame (15) frame including a mattress support (30, 31, 33, 35, 37), an articulation mechanism (90), a raise-and-lower mechanism (19, 20), and controls (22) for tilting the mattress support.

Response to Amendment

7. Applicant's arguments filed April 29, 1996 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

In response to Applicant's argument that claim 1 emphasizes the invention's character as a bariatric bed, it has been held that the recitation that an element is "adapted to" perform a function is not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to so perform. It does not constitute a limitation in any patentable sense. *In re Hutchison*, 69 USPQ 138.

Applicant's invention is intended to be used to support patients having weights in the range of 500 to 800 pounds. It has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987).

The beds of the prior art references are seen as inherently having the ability to support a patient having weights in the range of 500 to 800 pounds, even if the beds may not be able to support the patient for a long period of time before they may break.

In response to Applicant's argument that the prior art references do not anticipate the claimed invention, it has been held that a claim is anticipated if each element of the claim is found, either expressly described or under principles of inherency, in a single prior art reference, or that the claimed invention was previously known or embodied in a single prior art device or practice. *Kalman v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*, 218 USPQ 789. Since each element of the claim is

Art Unit: 3508

found in each of the prior art references, the claim is anticipated by Pupovic '929, Failor et al. '260 and Peck '529.

Conclusion

8. This is a continuation of applicant's earlier Application No. 08/382,150. The claim is drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for response to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the date of this action. In the event a first response is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event will the statutory period for response expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Teri Pham whose telephone number is (703) 305-7421.

Teri Pham
January 30, 1997



STEVEN N. MEYERS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 3500